

# The Republican.

No. 12, Vol. 11.] LONDON, Friday, March 25, 1825. [PRICE 6d.

## TO THE CHRISTIAN JUDGE BAILEY.

### LETTER XXVII.

Dorchester Gaol, March 19, 1825 of the  
CHRISTIAN, perverted worship of the Logos.  
I HAVE caught you in the act of blaspheming the Bible and the Bible God! Henry Lees of Ashton-under-Line has been tried before you, and though you warily stopped the case, before he could enter upon his defence, you denounced circumcision, so strictly enjoined by the Bible and the Bible God, as illegal! This is as much as to say, *that the law of England is contrary to the law of the Bible and the Bible God.* This is as much as to say, *that neither Judaism nor Christianity is part and parcel of the law of the land.* This is another contradiction in your administration of law, as a Christian Judge. For impugning the statements and recommendations of the Bible, I am in the sixth year of an imprisonment under your sentence, and this day I read in the New Times Newspaper, that you, from the judgment seat, have also impugned the strictly enjoined recommendation of the Bible as to circumcision, and have pronounced it *illegal!* If illegal, why are not the Jews prosecuted? Is there one law for the Jews and another for the followers of Johanna Southcote? Here is a pretty specimen of the clashing of religion with wholesome law. I will copy the report of the trial from the paper mentioned, and comment upon it.

LANCASTER, MARCH 14.

### MANSLAUGHTER.

Henry Lees was indicted for manslaughter, in having affected the death of Daniel Grimshaw, an infant, by circumcising him with a knife. There was a second count charging him with the same offence by circumcising with a pair of scissors.

Printed and Published by R. Carlile, 84, Fleet Street.

The prisoner is one of a sect of fanatics who have sprung up in the town of Ashton-under-Line. They have various rites and ceremonies, and have promulgated as one great article of their belief—first, that a Shiloh, and again that a second Jesus was to be born amongst them. This, as might be expected, has led to extraordinary notions and acts of every kind, each female in the sect being led to think she might in time become a second Mary. Amongst their other rites they have established circumcision and on this occasion the rite was practised on this child, who died shortly after it. The respectable inhabitants of the town, with a view to suppress the delusion, thought it necessary that the Coroner should be apprised of the circumstance. The latter held an inquisition, before whom the circumstances were inquired into, and the prisoner apprehended by his warrant upon a verdict found against him by the Jury. He was subsequently admitted to bail by direction of the Court of King's Bench, and appeared at the Assizes each day to take his trial for the offence. Many of the followers of the sect were also in Court, and attracted much attention by their appearance and garb; many of them like the Patriarchs of old, wearing beards of great length; others dressed in a uniform of blue cloth of quaker cut, with bright buttons. The prisoner was dressed in such a garb, but wore no beard. It is believed that he paid a fine to the Society for liberty to dispense with retaining one. When placed at the bar he appeared to be about 30 or 33 years of age, and of rather a dark countenance. He occasionally took notes, and was altogether at his ease during the trial. The others seemed to watch the trial with much attention, and it is to be hoped the opinion delivered this day by the Learned Judge will tend to effect the object the respectable inhabitants have had in view, viz. putting down the Sect; which they think has been only kept alive, and most probably from improper motives, by certain leaders of some wealth amongst them. To such an extent has their delusion prevailed with respect to the coming of Shiloh, notwithstanding the disappointment at the nonfulfilment of Johanna's prophecies in her own person, that the prisoner, who is in respectable circumstances, was induced to sanction a mock marriage of his own sister, at the chapel of their sect, to one of the pretended Prophets of their community, in the expectation that from the marriage the real Shiloh was to arise. The prophet himself was and had been long known to have a wife then living, and whom he had left chargeable on a parish in the neighbourhood. The lady, in due time, presented an appearance likely to realize all the hopes formed of her, except one! when, oh! sad and second disappointment, the new stranger proved to be a girl. The Prophet being soon afterwards detected in a house of ill-fame in Manchester, the lady became jealous, the real wife made her appearance to claim her share of the good things the Prophet was enjoying, a



riot ensued, and the poor Prophet was obliged to fly, as he found "no honour in his own country." Since he left the neighbourhood the sect have persevered in their strange notions of faith and morality, having, notwithstanding the backsliding of the discarded Prophet, such kindly feeling, that they believe the Lord himself has permitted him to fall for a season; and though Shiloh has been abandoned, they appear to be certain that Jesus Christ is to be born again from amongst them, in order to finish the good which in their opinion he left unaccomplished.

Mr. D. F. Jones having opened the indictment,

Mr. Raincock stated the case, and observed that it was one of an extraordinary nature, almost unprecedented, if not entirely so. The prisoner was charged with having occasioned the death of one Daniel Grimshaw, who was circumcised on the 16th of October last, and died on the 23d following. It appeared that in the populous town of Ashton-under-Line, there is a sect called "Johannas," who were, he believed, a number of the deluded followers of Johanna Southcot. They held a number of tenets, amongst which was the revived Jaudical ceremony of circumcision. On the eighth day after the child in question was born, it was taken to a garrett, called a chapel, where the prisoner officiated in performing the ceremony. The prisoner was formerly a machine-maker, but he now bears in the Johanna sect the office of circumcisor. The poor deluded parents of the child seemed to have fully consented to the operation being performed on their infant; and, in fact, on the same night, two other children of other persons of the sect were circumcised by him. During the ceremony a number of musicians, amounting, he had been informed, to thirty or forty, were playing music, whether to drown the cries of the children, or for what other purpose the Jury would form an opinion. Against the prisoner there was no imputation whatever of malice, no intention on his part of doing any grievous bodily harm to the child; if such had been the case, his crime would have borne a very different and much more serious aspect; at present the charge was the simple one of manslaughter. He (Mr. R.) would confine himself to the plain circumstances of the case, and the Jury would be informed of the law respecting it from the authority of the Judge. Of the illegality of the act itself he had no doubt; even if an adult were so deluded as to consent to the operation, no one possessed the right of performing it. He was told that it would be pleaded, that the child was of itself so weakly and so sickly, that it was never likely to live. This only aggravated the case. If its condition was such, that with all the care that could be bestowed upon it, there would be difficulty in preserving its life, how rash, how unlawful, must it be to add to its other ailments, the effects of such an operation. —[The learned Counsel here described the manner in which the operation was performed.]—The Child was born on Thursday the

9th, circumcised on Thursday the 16th, on the Monday following it became affected with fits, and also on the Wednesday—and on Thursday, the 23d, it died. If after the ceremony was performed, when so much care would become necessary, the death of the child should proceed from the neglect of the parents, (who conceiving it to be a religious rite, might almost expect to be cured of itself,) still the prisoner must be legally accountable for the act itself.

The mother and father of the child, and other persons of the same family, proved the facts stated by Mr Raincock. The father, a collier, stated that he had been circumcised, as did also the other male witness, who is a Patriarch of the Sect, and displays a beard of patriarchal dimensions.

Mr. Thomas Ogden, a surgeon at Ashton-under-Line, stated he was called in to examine the child on the 24th December last. On opening it the internal parts were perfectly healthy; the head was also healthy; the child appeared to be rather in an emaciated condition. Mr. Ogden proceeded to state, that mortification had arisen when he saw the child; but of its cause he could not speak with certainty. He attributed the child's death rather to treatment after the circumcision, than to the circumcision itself. The probable causes were the application of a ligature and a spider's web, which, with a cloth, were continued on too long.

Mr. Justice Bayley—Don't you think, Mr. Raincock, this puts an end to the case? This witness states that the death of the party has been caused, not by the wound made as stated in the indictment, but by mortification in consequence of a ligature.

Mr. Raincock submitted that the circumstances arose from the act of the prisoner, the ligature and spider's web being applied to heal the wound made by him. It was a fit case to go to the Jury—Whether, death having ensued by his act originally—he was not legally accountable for it?

Mr Justice Bayley—The only person's evidence we can go by here, is the surgeon to prove the cause of the death. He expressly says, circumcision is not of itself a dangerous operation; how then can the prisoner be held accountable for a death that arises upon what the physician describes as after-treatment? The indictment alledges the death to be caused by the cut alone, and this his testimony completely negatives—and the child's death appears to me to have been produced by the combined acts of cutting, binding up, and the cobweb. When I read the depositions, I was afraid the death might not be correctly described, and I called the attention of the Grand Jury to this circumstance. If a wound is given which may be in itself mortal, and it terminates fatally in consequence of improper treatment afterwards, it is murder or manslaughter according to the circumstances. If, however, the wound was not mortal, but made so in reference to



what is afterwards done, it is neither manslaughter or murder. Now, according to the testimony of this gentleman, the mere act of cutting was not of itself likely to terminate fatally, but that the death arose from other means afterwards adopted, and turning that which was not originally mortal into a mortal wound. My notion of the law on this point agrees with the opinion stated by the Counsel for the prosecution, that it was an illegal act to treat a child of such tender years in that manner. Nothing that falls from me shall ever encourage such a practice. If the indictment had correctly described the cause of the child's death, I should have directed the Jury to find the prisoner Guilty. This is an illegal operation, and I wish it henceforth to be understood, that all who practice it, shall be answerable for the consequences.

Mr. Raincock said, the object of the prosecutor was principally to suppress the practice.

Mr. Justice Bayley—I am sure you have no other object, nor have I; and I think both will be satisfied by the present prosecution. I desire it to be perfectly understood, that no matter whether the party acts from a religious conviction or not that they are doing what is right; they are not, therefore, warranted to practice illegal acts, more especially acts on infants, acts which may cause or lead to the death of a child. Those practices, then, are the more reprehensible, because they cannot be considered as consenting thereto. The prisoner is, therefore acquitted, from the indictment not having correctly described the cause of the child's death, and not from any doubt as to the illegality of the practice.

The Jury, under his Lordship's directions, Acquitted the prisoner.

Mr. Justice Bayley—Mr. Lees, as far as my advice will go, let me recommend you will forbear these practices, and to abstain from them, if not altogether, with reference to children at least.

The prisoner bowed to the Court, and was discharged out of custody.

I thought, that my letter to Henry Lees, of which I sent you a copy, would answer some purpose. It would have been a great outrage on Christian consistency, if any punishment had been inflicted upon this man, though he morally deserved it. I know nothing of what defence he had prepared, or whether he had employed counsel; but, you might have been assured, that he had read my letter, and you were evidently glad to stop the case. I condemn nothing in your conduct, in this case. Under all the circumstances it was very proper; for the defence you dreaded; and to punish the man for acting upon the strict injunctions of the Bible would have been a disclaimer to your title of being a Chris-

tian Judge. What I beg of you is, to consider the impropriety, the evident injustice, of making religion a part of social law. In the case of Henry Lees, you have a serious circumstance for consideration: a child is religiously killed, and the law is so hampered by other religious associations, that, in this case, it cannot be administered with justice. An outrage is committed that leads to death; the parties are all known and one is arraigned; and the Court finds itself in a similar predicament, has not clean hands, and cannot revenge the death of the child on its slayer and his abettors. Law and Justice are sacrificed to religion.

The reporter's preamble to the trial is a Christian Libel, and I really hope, that Henry Lees, or the respectable sect of Southcotians, will turn round and prosecute Dr. Stoddart for publishing it. There is no more delusion among the followers of Johanna Southcote, than among any other Christian sect that worships a personified God, whether in trinity or in unity. Is not Shiloh promised in the Bible, as well as the Messiah or Jesus? and have not the Jewish women long held hopes each of being the mother of the Messiah? But last week, there died at Bridport, an old man, of the name of Samuel Best, who, for thirty or forty years, had assured himself, that he was the Messiah to lead the Jews back to the land of their fathers, if any one can say where that land is; for the modern Judea was but a colony, an inheritance by the sufferance of the Persian dynasty. So we see, on all sides, and at all times, what abominable, what dreadful, delusions, and other bad effects, this Bible produces among those who do not understand it, as I and others do.

You, Mr. Justice Bailey, have written, as if you looked for the second coming of Jesus, and is it not as reasonable, that the followers of Johanna Southcote should expect to have his birth from a member of their sect, as that you should expect him to spring from any other sect, or to come in the clouds without another immaculate conception, without again being analysed and condensed into human seed? Seeing, that they, by the rite of circumcision, are the only Christians who conform to the Christianity of the Gospels, is it not reasonable among you Christians, that they should claim a preference as to sect? If you can expect to see Jesus Christ come in a shower of rain, and to go up in the air to meet him, and it is taught in the Epistle to the Thessalonians, may not the Southcotians as reasonably rely upon a natural birth, even if the prophetess be a second wife? The prophet Hosea was ordered to seek a child from whoredom;



and Isaiah took witnesses to the fact of his begetting a young Messiah, so that this Christian Critic of the New Times had but little of fair ground to crow upon. All the nonsense practised and held by these Southcotians is drawn from the general source of delusion, the Bible. They are nothing inferior to you and your sect, on the score of delusion; with, at least, the advantage of consistency, of acting up to every injunction and instruction of the sacred book.

This Christian Critic tells us, that the Patriarchs wore beards. To the best of my recollection, the Bible says nothing of beards, until the time of David, when some messengers were sent to a foreign prince, who shaved them, as his answer to the message, and brought down upon himself the vengeance of the man after God's own heart. To shave a man now a day, would be deemed an act of hospitality; but, formerly, it seems to have been enough of cause for a war between nations! I hold the act to be a silly habit, and with a bad razor, a very troublesome one. The circumstance, that Samson was not to have a razor pass over him, indicates, that beards were not worn by the Patriarchs. His case was to be an exception to the general rule, and though the Mosaic Law treats on many trifles, as relating to the person, I am not aware, that it has a word about shaving.

He also indicates, that the object of the prosecution was to put down the sect; whilst, I engage to say, that it will soon double its numbers; nor will your unchristian, though legal, opinion and warning be heeded. So long as the Bible is connected with and supported by the law, no man can be justly punished, by the administrators of that law, for any action enjoined by that book.

We now come to Mr. Raincock's speech, which is also very unchristian. He says, that, *the poor deluded parents of the child seemed to have fully consented to the operation.* Why not? They had the Bible for their authority; whilst, the churching of women and the baptism of new born infants, as the first remove from the bed to the cold and damp church, damp with rotting carcasses, have been the destruction of thousands, without the slightest Bible sanction.

Mr. Raincock said, that he had no doubt of the illegality of the act, even in the case of an adult. If so, that illegality must extend to the Jews, and why are they not indicted? I do not call for persecution on the Jews; they may do as they please with themselves, so as they do not meddle with me; but that cannot be legal with the Jew, which is not legal with the Christian, since each equally reveres the pre-

cepts of the Old Testament. You Mr. Justice Bailey, agree with him, and say, that *nothing that falls from you shall ever encourage such a practice*; whilst the whole tenor of your life has encouraged such practices. It is vain for you to wince and mince the matter. You strenuously recommend the Bible to be read and followed, as a good book. You have assisted to punish me barbarously, thievishly and even villainously, because, I said it was not a good book and ought not to be read and followed; and now, you renounce the most solemn injunction in the whole book, and say, that you will never encourage it! Pray read over again my letter to Henry Lees, and learn, that you are resisting the ordinance of that God and that Religion, about which, you make more fuss than any other man on the bench.

It is quite amusing to see how eager you were to prevent a defence of the act. Mr. Lees must have seen this, and you may be assured, that he will not take your word as to its legality. If you say, that it is illegal, you place the word of man above the word of your God, you deny your word of God, and, with me, become a blasphemer both of your God and his Bible. With me, or under my view of things, the act of Henry Lees was illegal; but how it can be so under your religious view of law, I cannot understand.

I do not impute blame to you, for your conduct at this trial, it was praise worthy; but it clashes ominously with your conduct towards me. It proves, that a religious man cannot, under all circumstances, be an honest man. Therefore, this exposure is my proper business, my just resentment. I incline to think, that, but for my letter to Henry Lees, the case would have taken a different turn. I saw, that I could, and determined that I would, point out to him a complete exculpatory line of defence, and at the same time, send you a copy of it. The circumstance has had the desired effect, and must make you pause before you renew your panegyrics upon the Christian Religion. By no means do I justify the act of circumcision, it is to be abhorred as a practice towards infants, or towards adults, exposing them to pain and danger without the least useful object. But it comes from your Bible, from that detestable book, that book of every thing foul, that has caused more human misery than any other one thing or circumstance, and whilst you cry up the book, you cannot consistently cry down its injunctions.

I promise you solemnly, that, if I have sufficient influence to do it, I will get a Jew indicted for circumcision, if ever you, or any other judge, punish, for that act, a follow-



er of Johanna Southcote. It will be fine sport to indict every Jew for the act. Nothing better can be done at this time, for the future welfare of mankind, than to push every such case before a court of law. I am delighted with this trial of Henry Lees; for, it is impossible, that any one branch of Christianity can be thus denounced without effecting the whole. If I were a member of the House of Commons, I would carry the case of Lees into that house, and show the gross inconsistency of indicting a man, because a child died after circumcision, when the churching of newly delivered women, and the baptism of new born infants, has an equal tendency to produce the same effect. Henry Lees was no more a criminal, than you the Judge that tried him. It was like Judge, like criminal: and, it is to me, a matter of regret, that we did not get a defence from the man.

I fear, that I shall not be able to go through your book of Notes on the book of Common Prayer. It will be many weeks hence, before I have a present prospect of again looking at it. Subjects for discussion thicken on me so fast, of more importance than your book, that I must lay it by, until such subjects become more scarce. But I can assure you, that, my assurance of triumph over you grows with my imprisonment. I am now the master of religion of any kind, of all your Gods and Goddesses, and see, that it only wants a fair exhibition, to be scouted by all wise and good men. You see, in what a degraded situation you were placed, by becoming the Judge of Henry Lees. You were obliged to condemn your own conduct, by shuffling between wholesome law and religion. You could not support the one without offering violence to the other. I will narrate to you a somewhat similar circumstance, with which I have been lately connected.

On the 9th Inst., the New High Sheriff for this county sent me word, that he and a friend would be glad to see me. I was agreeable, as I am to see and converse with every person who has done me no wrong, and even with such, on matters of religion; because I can annoy them sweetly and make them feel shame. The time was dusk, in the evening, after which, I never expect to see any one but the officers of the Gaol. The Gaoler introduced the Sheriff, and, with him, two other gentlemen, not even mentioned to me by name; but understood to be friends of the Sheriff. After exchanging a word or two, they all sat down, and one of them, a young man of talent and prepossessing appearance, seemed inclined to take a lead in the conversation, which soon be-

came discussion on matters of religion. I always suppose, that, if a person, who is a stranger, comes to converse with me, he comes for that purpose. This was such a case. He defended the Christian Religion upon the plea of the utility of keeping mankind in a state of hope and fear about future rewards and punishments. I met him with the answer, that present rewards and punishments, that are certain, are matters of greater weight with mankind, than the prospect of those which are confessedly uncertain; surrounding this observation with such other applicable ideas as came up at the time. I then disputed the worth of the Gospels and Epistles of the New Testament as a moral code, and contended that there was not a good moral sentence in them, but that was borrowed from other writings. The Gentleman, then turned to the one of forbearance, and said, that it, was carried further in the New Testament than in any other moral treatise, instancing the recommendations, that, if a blow was struck on one cheek of a Christian, he should present the other, that if a man forced him to go a mile, he should go twain, and if he sought his coat he should give him up his cloak also. I stated supposititious cases, in which the Gentleman should be a party, and asked him how he, as a christian would act; to which he could give me no clear answer. Indeed, I made it plain, that it was the duty of every man to resist the wrong doer, and not to yield, when there was a means of resistance: that, upon his principle, one bad man could make a common prey of a community. He then sheltered himself under the Bible promise, that all mankind were to become alike, and that none would be left with the disposition to wrong. I could but smile, and observe, that the accomplishment was very slow in its progress. "Slow, do you say, dear, Mr. Carlile see how Christianity is extending itself." I reminded him, that the Mahometans had nearly expelled it from Asia and Africa, that it was only now progressing with the most ignorant of mankind: and that, in its very hot-bed of proselytism, England, it was being undermined by science. On rising to go, I observed to Mr. Spurrier, the High Sheriff, that, I hoped he would find a better chaplain, than Mr. Garland found in Mr. Richman; on which, as if unintentionally, they all laughed heartily and acknowledged, that the young gentleman with whom I had been disputing was Mr. Spurrier's Chaplain. I gave him immediately a copy of my critique on Mr. Richman's two sermons, told him, that I preferred to discuss the subject of religion with a clergyman, and pressed him to



call on me again. He would not promise to call again; but said, he thought it probable, that he might write. I assured him, that, if he wrote, I would print and answer. We parted in a very agreeable manner, on my assuring him, that if I convinced him of error, I would not call upon him to throw up his benefices; that, I never taxed human nature to such an extent, and thought it proper, that he and his brother clergymen should hold on until the legislature made a disposal of the Church Property.

The next day, this young Chaplain had to preach before the Judges, and took his text from 1 Timothy, chap. 1, ver. 9: *Knowing this, that the law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient.* Now, this text, and sermon formed a case in point, of direct opposition to the doctrine which the Gentleman had attempted to inculcate before me on the previous evening, as his last and main argument for the Christian Religion. To have been consistent, he should have gone into his pulpit and have said: "I am engaged, as a Chaplain to the High Sheriff, to preach before you the Judges of Assize, for this county, and as a Christian Minister of the Gospel, I must tell you, that, though you have a commission from the King to hold an assize, to try the criminal and to punish the wrong doer; that though you have human law to countenance and encourage you in this matter, I, as a minister of the Gospel, come before you, with a higher law, with the divine law, with the law of our religion, of Christianity, of the Gospel of our blessed Lord, and Saviour, which says, you shall not punish the wrong doer, you shall not resist a blow, nor sue him at law who steals your coat, you shall not return evil for evil; but bless them that persecute you, and do good to them that despitefully use you." How would that Christian Magistrate, Mr. Justice Park, have stared at such a really christian sermon? The fact is, that if the Bible, or even the Christian Religion alone, as it is founded in the New Testament, were strictly followed, no community could hold together with it; all would be anarchy, confusion and bloodshed, the bad man preying upon the praying fanatic.

Here is more proof for you of the truly horrible character of my persecution and imprisonment; that religion is not useful to a community; but that it is vice; and that a religious man cannot be in all cases an honest man, as a moral man can be, who is proudly devoid of religion.

RICHARD CARLILE.

*The following article was offered to the Editor of the "Catholic Friend" and returned with the following note.*

"THE enclosed is more proper for the Republican than the Catholic Friend."

---

### TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC FRIEND.

---

SIR,

Dorchester Gaol, March 4, 1825.

IN your second number you notice a new French sect of Christians, which profess to believe and practice nothing more than Christian Morals, or the moral part of the New Testament. You call this sect, absurd, heretical and schismatic, and very erroneously compare its members, with those in London, who call themselves Freethinking Christians. In your second sentence, you tell us that this new sect *has no creed of any kind*, and, in your third sentence, you say, "it shuts out two of the cardinal virtues from *its creed*"—*faith* and *hope*, which you fear will also exclude a third—*charity*. Your contradictions prove that you were upon a nonsensical subject, writing a string of words that had no meaning. *Creed* is *belief*, and *belief* can only exist as *a part of knowledge*; therefore, as *faith*, *hope* and *charity* indicate nothing more than dispositions of mind, I contend, that *disposition of mind* cannot form a component part of a creed, and that, *faith*, *hope* and *charity* have nothing to do with any creed.

In the first number of your work, you promised to answer attacks made upon the Roman Catholic Religion, and you announced the support of several literary gentlemen in conducting it. This was a challenge to all opponents. I am your opponent, inasmuch as I disagree with the tenets of the Roman Catholic Church; but, I am for settling every dispute of the kind with no other weapon than free discussion. I shall, therefore, not only shew error in the little paragraph noticed, but attack your faith fundamentally. I deny, and will maintain it, *that no Christian Sect has a creed; that the Roman Catholic Church, itself, has no creed; that a Christian can have no creed on the subject of religion.*

You have a string of words which you call a creed. The



first sentence in this string of words is, "I believe in God the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth." This you will call the first principle of your creed; but I deny that it is, or that it can be, a creed, or a part of a creed.

In the first place, you personify a being of which you have no knowledge, and, in which consequently, you cannot believe: and in the second, you name a location, or heaven, of which you have not the least knowledge, and, consequently, cannot believe. Again, you call this fictitious being, the maker of the earth, of which you have not the slightest particle of proof, and for the want of which, you cannot believe. If you can believe without a knowledge of the object of your belief, I pray you, or one of your literary friends, to explain that paradox to me.

One of your apostles has asserted, that "faith is the evidence of things not seen." In this assertion there is a great error; for, of things not seen, there can be no evidence, or, to speak more generally, of things, not brought, in some shape, within the cognizance of our senses, there can be no evidence. They must have been seen or felt by some one, to justify the smallest amount of faith.

I will not begin with too long a letter; but if you will answer my attacks, I will undertake to prove, *that no such a person as the God of your alleged creed exists; that no such a person as your Jesus Christ ever existed: that no divine revelation was made to a people called Jews or Israelites; that no such a nation occupied any part of Syria before the Babylonian Captivity and Colonization at that place, which has since borne the name of Jerusalem; and that religion of any kind or character is a vice, and a great evil among mankind.*

Notwithstanding these my sentiments, I am decidedly friendly, under the present state of things, to an equality of social rights and privileges among all religious sects, not excluding those, who like myself, have renounced every thing under the name of religion. But, I will take the liberty to give you Roman Catholics a word of advice. The Roman Catholics, who first called themselves Protestants, who forsook your Church and accomplished what they called the Reformation, succeeded, by associating with their pretences notions of increased human liberty. The cry of liberty was entirely on their side, and imputations of slavery were thrown on yours. Civil and religious liberty and Protestantism have passed as synonymous terms for three centuries. If you,

the Roman Catholics, wish to retort a triumph upon the Protestants, you must enlist the feelings of the disinterested on your side, by shewing them, that you are prepared to go as far, or farther, in the way of increased liberty or liberality in political Government, than the Protestants have gone, or promise to go. You have a fine example in America, so large a portion of which is politically a Republic associated with your Church. And, if I know any thing of the right constitution of the Roman Catholic Church, it is favourable to political republics, and would thrive better without than with monarchical governments. Looking at you, the Roman Catholics of England and Ireland, as a sect beginning to raise your head, after a long, severe, and even cruel persecution, I am of opinion, that, even a temporary success depends upon your associating yourselves with a higher degree of political liberty, than the existing government allows. Outstep the majority of the Protestants on this ground, and the history of human nature is a pledge of your success, of your triumph in the race for superiority.

I will conclude, with a brief further notice of the paragraph, on which I began this letter as a criticism. Your work gave me the first information of this new sect in France; therefore, you may be assured, that I have no further connection with them, than principles indicate. But, I am sure, that if you had known the proceedings of the persons in London called Freethinking Christians, you would not have classed them with the Christian Moralists of France. These persons called Freethinking Christians, do not deserve the denomination of a sect. They make no progress, and remain as they begun, a mere family concern. Thompson's family, the venders of Gin, form the head and tail of the association; though his tyranny has been so offensive as to make a division, which sometime back, was led by another vender of Gin of the name of Stevens. I have been assured, by one, who was several years associated with Thompson and his family, that, the regulations of the association are not much unlike those of the abused Jesuits, and, that Mr. Thompson may be considered a new Loyola, a General of Jesuits, a Father Confessor to the body. He professes the right to take cognizance of your political transactions, your domestic transactions, your moral transactions, and your money transactions, without the least objection to become a general banker to the association. If I had an impulse to choose a religion, I should certainly prefer the Roman Catholic Church to an association with these venders of Gin



and Gospel. Every Christian is a *free-thinking* Christian; but, in the proceedings of the association under that name, there is nothing enlightened, nothing free, nothing respectable. Now, on the face of the *Société de le Morale Chretienne*, there is something respectable.

Respectfully yours,

RICHARD CARLILE.

---

COPY OF A LETTER SENT TO THE KING,  
WINDSOR CASTLE.

---

SIR,

Dorchester Gaol, March 12, 1825.

You are stiled the Grand Patron of the Association of Freemasons, and I shall shortly unfold to the public, that you are the grand patron of a grand delusion and of as useless and mischievous a piece of mumery as was ever either patronized or unpatronized.

I have been long assured, without a knowledge of particulars, that there could be nothing really good, or unmixed with evil, that was supported by royalty, aristocracy and a priesthood. Before I knew any thing of the particulars of Masonry, I pronounced, from my knowledge of man and things, that the grand secret was no secret, or alike a secret to all, something expected but never gained.

I will now shew you, that a connection with such an association is disgraceful to any magistrate, much more so as to a chief magistrate. It makes a part of that general system of delusion upon the multitude, in which much of error and mischief is mixed up with a little that is good, and the title of good foisted upon the pernicious compound.

A full exposition of Free Masonry, which I am about to make, will afford another proof, that any kind of oath-making, particularly by secret oaths, such as are practised in Masonic Lodges, is a vice and injurious to the community as a whole.

I am, Sir, your prisoner,

RICHARD CARLILE.

TO MR. R. CARLILE, DORCHESTER GAOL.

DEAR SIR,

Devon, March 15, 1825.

I HAVE observed with some regret, your controversy with Cobbett and the Dorchester Editor. I regret it, because, by your ridiculing and abusing each other, you lower yourselves in the estimation of your readers; and your enemies will laugh and exult at it. I consider almost every man that writes for the public to be far beyond the average of his fellow men in ability; because the number that can write are very few in comparison with the whole, and therefore they do not deserve so much ridicule as they commonly bestow on each other. I observe, more particularly, what you and your opponents say about the merits of Dryden, and Lord Byron. Here I will chime in among you with my own opinion. In the first place, the Dorsetshire Editor says, that Lord Byron's genius was a thousand times more lofty and brilliant than your clod-like ignorance. I was was sorry to see such words in print, and it is preposterous to attempt to draw a comparison between the genius of a poet and a prose writer. There are many great geniuses in science, and in different branches of literature, that cannot write a verse in poetry, and that never acquired a taste for its beauties. Lord Byron certainly had a wonderful genius. His writings, or at least the part that I have read of them, contain much dross as well as much gold. You say, he will be as little thought of in another century as Dryden is now. In this, I readily believe you; and I believe, that Lord Byron would have gladly compounded with posterity for Dryden's fame. I am of opinion, that Dryden, although he is a century and a half older than Lord Byron, will outlive him, and all the other poets of the present age; for it is observed, that, although the poetry of the present age is more gorgeous and fanciful than in the days of Pope, yet, it has declined in perspicuity and coherence. Pope only considered himself as a disciple of Dryden; and you must not suppose, because we do not continue to read him, that he is gone off the shelves. He is only laid by, to make room for the abundance of new matter that is continually pressing on us. He still stands in the second rank among the British poets, and will hold his place until Shakespeare and Milton and Spencer are eclipsed.



Take the opinion of another Herculean Poet on the genius and merits of Dryden:—

“ Here let me bend, great Dryden, at thy shrine,  
Thou dearest name to all the tuneful nine.  
What if some dull lines in cold order creep,  
And with his theme the Poet seems to sleep?  
Still, when his subject rises proud to view,  
With equal strength the Poet rises too:  
With strong invention, noblest vigour fraught,  
Thought still springs up and rises out of thought;  
Numbers ennobling numbers in their course,  
In varied sweetness flow, in varied force;  
The powers of genius and of judgment join,  
And the whole art of poetry is thine.”

Another correspondent, by the name of Zephyrus, has been barking at you about what you said of Lord Byron. He compares you with him, as a twinkling star to the sun; and you were never more happy in an expression, than in one which your answer to Zephyrus contained—‘ that the twinkling star is also a sun at a greater distance from man’s view.’ Zephyrus asks, what has Dryden ever written to be compared with Lord Byron’s works? Now I would advise both you and Zephyrus, without intending the least disparagement to either, to let poets and poetry alone. Poetry is not your element. Let the public opinion be your guide. It is always more certain than individual criticism. I have read, comparatively, a good deal of poetry and criticisms thereon, and I have learnt by reading it, what presumption and folly it would be in me to attempt a couplet of my own. I am totally devoid of genius for making poetry; but I read it with pleasure and always considered it as the most delightful branch of literature. I am not so much a slave to it as to read all the trash that comes in my way; but when it is not below mediocrity I can give it time and attention.

I will now say a few words on the business which more immediately concerns you, and for which you are suffering an unjust punishment. I have heard from good authority, that the Parsons of the Church of England are getting ashamed of their craft. Ashamed to read the Bible to their congregations. At one place in this neighbourhood, the first lesson for the evening service on the second Sunday in Lent was omitted to be read, and another substituted. At another place, some of the indecent words were omitted in reading the proper lesson, which was the 34th chapter of Genesis.

No. 12, Vol. XI.

I verily think, that my authority is good, but had I suspected that such a circumstance would have occurred, I would have witnessed it myself. What will the Bible fellows, as Mr. Cobbett terms them, say to this? They are cramming them into the hands of all descriptions of people, that is, of the lower ranks—young men and maidens, old men and children, and at the same time, their own clergy are ashamed to read it. Stop your hands, you silly blockheads, and distribute no more Bibles, if you wish to keep up the farce of your religion; for, if you continue to raise upon the old building, the foundation will give way, and down will come the fabric about your ears. The Catholic clergy are more crafty than you. Their priests will not allow their flocks to read the Bible, and who can wonder at it? I suspect that the Bible fellows are ignorant of its contents, or that they consist of such ruffians only as are wishing for war, that they may fill their pockets by contracts, rapine, and plunder.—I am well assured, that the Bible has been the greatest help to reconcile the minds of the ignorant to war and bloodshed. I have often heard them express their minds on the subject in this manner: *that war is ordained by God, because, say they, it has always been practised and we read of it in the Bible.* Such simpletons are not aware that the same reason will serve in favour of rape, robbery, adultery, theft, and every crime on the catalogue. They were all committed in old time: they were the acts of individuals, and we read of them in the Bible.

But so it is; the crafty will always practise their arts on the ignorant, the ignorant will always be credulous; and the credulous will always be better pleased with fiction than with truth. Witness with what avidity novels are read. The great majority of readers throughout the Island are novel readers; and though they are sensible, that all they read is fiction, yet they take the liveliest pleasure in relating the contents.

I find, that witches are yet in existence among us;—a few days since, stolen goods were returned, by a threat of the owner to consult a witch in this neighbourhood.

Yours respectfully,

AN INFIDEL.



## REFLECTIONS ON HORSEBACK.

BY REGULATOR.

## No. 1.

THE unceasing change in religion shows the fallacy of religion. If religion were a matter of fact and capable of being reduced to first principles, its uniformity and universality would be established; but while religion is a fiction, a mere phantom of the brain, it will never assume a permanent character. We need not wonder at the numberless sects that exist; but only be surprised, that more do not abound. Avarice and fanaticism, active and restless passions of the mind, bring and will bring, while the people remain ignorant, hordes of knaves and projectors into this field. While there is something to be got by deceiving, there will be always deceivers. While ignorance propagates the morbid passion of religion, there will be characters pretending to cure the imaginary infirmity. Religious people are a species of Hypochondriacs; they imagine, that they want to be cured of a disorder, that does not exist; they seek the aid of a Quack, who applies his panacea of salvation, who tells the valetudinarian, that, if he will believe some absurd trash, he will be saved; and so delusion stands in the situation of fact.

## No. 2.

My horse reasons: he knew nothing untill he was taught: His mind, or brain was a *Tabula rasa*. He knows the difference between right and wrong—pleasure and pain. If two roads present, he will take the shortest to his stable; because, the shortest will bring him to the place most agreeable to him. He possesses those great properties which constitute the human mind—sensation, understanding, memory. I never heard of a Horse being an *idiot*. They are all capable of education: they are all capable of a degree of improvement which none have ever attained: the organization of the horse differs from man, each have capacities and excellencies peculiar to themselves. I excel my horse in the usefulness of my hands and my tongue; but he excels me in the acuteness of his smell and his hearing. Horses are gregarious as well as men: they are a social animal, and

have a physiognomy that expresses many of their passions and reflections. I have constantly noticed similar moral effects in the Horse, as in the human subject, arising from Physical causes. They are similarly acted upon by similar agents; the only difference is in degree, and that difference arises from the different organization of the two animals, sometimes exceeding in one, and sometimes in the other. The mind of man and the mind of the horse are subject to the influence of diet. If both are kept upon low diet, there will be a corresponding mental depression, passiveness and obedience; if both are kept well, spirit and gaiety is the effect. This proves, that the organization of both is similarly acted upon by similar stimulus, and that the passions or ideas of both are acted upon by causes that act upon the organization. The mind of the man and of the Horse are made up of material agents; both minds are built up out of Physical actions; they are combined from material causes; the minds of both are improved by practise, as the legs are improved in agility by the dancing master, or the arms by the pugilist. The legs do not think, because it is not compatible with their organization; neither does the brain run; because that sort of motion is not according to its constitution. It is the province of one part to perform one office, and another part another. Nobody talks about the immaterial motion of the hand; but if they did, the idea would be destroyed by dividing the brachial nerve, so that immateriality would be seen to be in the nerve. The case is exactly similar with the head, the heart and any part of the body; they are all just as immaterial as the hand. To say that any part of the body is moved by an immaterial principle is absurd; because it is tantamount to saying, that nothing can move something, or that nothing and something are the same, which is foolish and untrue. In me and my Horse all these physiological facts coincide; it is unnecessary to enter into a minute comparison of what must be self evident to every one. The horse and the man are well known to be capable of the passions of love and hatred, and revenge, and friendship. The horse can play and be sorrowful, as well as man or a dog. He has a tenacious memory and is fond of music and hunting; and if he had the organ of speech, oftentimes would he make his rider blush with his good lash and reflection. The voice of the horse is entirely guttural, which precludes the possibility, of his ever acquiring the faculty of speech. The knowledge of the horse is not only increased by experience, but, without practice, is subject



to decay; and, old age, in each, destroys the faculty of thought. A horse is acted upon by all the agents, that act upon me. He is subject to similar diseases that admit of similar treatment, to inflammation, to spasms, and obstructions. He is similarly influenced by heat and cold; refreshed by rest and exhausted by exertion. Chemistry has detected no difference between the blood of the horse and the rider, the same properties are common to both.

The horse has a smaller quantity of brain than man; a fact, that would lead us to presume, that, if he had had the faculty of speech, he never could have arrived at the perfection in the sciences some men have attained; but yet it is quite possible, that, by education, he would have excelled many that claim the privilege of being his master, and put him to shame. There can be no doubt, but that a horse combines his ideas, or that, there is a regular and connected succession of thoughts in his mind, relating to the same point. A horse knows the consequence of a proper or a wrong action, when he has been corrected for a fault. He shows that he knows the consequence by his alarm. Doubtless, he reflects upon and compares his experience. It is only the fact that I contend for, in opposition to the soul mongers. I do not enter into the extent of the metaphysical qualities of the horse, that is a question not determinable; but I only show that they exist, that they are in extent much according to the experience of the horse, his education and the strength of the organization of the cranial members; by cranial members, I mean all those convolutions, fissures and protuberances of the brain.

I am not aware, that the experiment has been attempted yet, but I should not doubt, if made, that a horse could be taught to demonstrate the 47th proposition in Euclid. I should like it to be tried, and should like to see the emancipation of horses to depend upon it. In making this reflection about the mental powers of the horse, I have no atheistical object in view; for, I am one, who thinks, that a benevolent God, and an omnipotent God, would not create any animal to be maltreated as horses are in post work and stage coaches, I cannot bring my mind to identify cruelty with goodness, as the Christians do. My only object in committing this to paper is, to prove, that the horse is not the brute, that he is represented. If he has not vocal organs, he has feelings. He hears and sees and reflects, and has sensible nerves as well as man; and that the one is quite as material a person as the other. If it can be proved, that one has a soul I will

admit the other has; but, for my part, I can discover no other than a material rise and decay. The only difference between a man and a horse, is a trifling arrangement in the organization or distribution of matter, depending upon one of the elementary laws of matter. It seems quite as difficult to account for the origin of the first horse, as well as the first man, they have arisen like a cheese mite, from a peculiar combination of matter placed under specific circumstances. I explain by the term *specific*, such as uniform heat to an egg, and such of cold. An animal is produced by a combination of male and female matter, in this there is nothing spiritual, and any body may believe it, better than that something can be made out of nothing. I may be absurd; but the Christians believe in a succession of absurdities, and it is quite as reasonable in me, to claim belief in the rational powers of the horse, as for them to require me to believe, that I shall *live after I am dead!* except in a fresh organization of matter. I am glad that Christian Metempsychosis will not make me conscious of existence as a stage or post horse.

---

### COPY OF A LETTER SENT TO THE KING, WINDSOR CASTLE.

---

SIR,

Dorchester Gaol, March 20, 1825.

ONE of your Judges, Mr. Justice Bailey, has pronounced from the bench, at Lancaster, in the case of the prosecution of Henry Lees for circumcising a child, that it is illegal so to perform the act of circumcision. I pray you to read No. 23, Vol. 10 of the Republican, and then say, if it is illegal. I further pray you, to order your Attorney General, to file an information against Mr. Justice Bailey, for his blasphemy of the Bible and the Bible God, and to send him down here, as quickly as possible, to take my place, as I find that I have been here long enough, when the Judges of the land, who sent me here, begin to imitate my conduct.

I am, Sir, your prisoner,

RICHARD CARLILE.



COPY OF A LETTER SENT TO THE KING,  
WINDSOR CASTLE.

SIR, Dorchester Gaol, March 18, 1825.

I AM very glad to see the question of reform taken up and continued by your ministers, even, in any degree, as it proves, that, no word uttered upon the subject is a word lost. The men, who have been called Reformers, have, for many years past, been denouncing the mode of packing juries, and have proclaimed, that, in all cases, where the prosecution was carried on by your Law Officers, a Jury, or such a Jury as has been presented to the defendant has been worse than none. Mr. Peel has been moved to introduce a bill into the legislature, which, evidently, leaves no ground for future complaint: and, I hope, that it is a presage, that the law of public libel, as it has been erroneously called, is to be extinct.

No government ever gained strength, safety, or any kind of advantage, by a prosecution for libel; but the reverse. Every prosecution of the kind has exhibited weakness and fear, with a sense of corruption and bad foundation in the system. And so far from terrifying public writers, every prosecution of the kind has been made a powerful source of public instruction; and examination will show, that each succeeding piece of writing prosecuted has been stronger than the former.

“What,” it may be said, “are we who administer the affairs of government to bear with whatever attacks any scribbler may be disposed to make upon us?” I answer by all *means*; if you feel strong, shew it, by not fearing any attack; for, even if an attack be false, and in every way foul, it will only strengthen you, by giving the writers on your side a sure means of triumph in explanation. Such a circumstance is desirable to any good government; for it consorts with the passions of mankind, that, without hostility of this kind, the best of systems would fail into corruption and become the worst of administrations.

Again, it may be said: "What, are we to allow religion to be attacked in any and in every shape?" I say, *yes*; for *truth is the best religion, and the only good religion for mankind, and truth cannot be proved untrue, cannot be shaken, but is made strong by being hostilely assaulted.* There is

merit even in an erroneous attack upon any system of things; for it leads to discussion, and discussion alone can weed out that which is wrong, whilst it cannot remove that which is right and sound.

Free discussion is the only panacea for human ills, and certainly will eradicate all disease from the political system, without the slightest injury to the sound part, with an invigoration of all that is good. It is the proper preliminary to every kind of reform; and the sure criterion, that, under its influence, nothing will be done with violence. It is a matter of astonishment, that the propriety of free discussion should ever have been disputed, and still more so, that when disputed, all to whom it was useful, did not rise and enforce it. It shews to what deep degradation, and servility mankind by their education, by priestcraft: and by government, have been reduced, and how deeply they must remain degraded, until they practice free discussion.

I am, Sir, your prisoner,

RICHARD CARLILE.

---

TO MR. R. CARLILE, DORCHESTER GAOL.

SIR,

Salford, Manchester, Feb. 20, 1825.

AGREEABLE to your wishes, as expressed in the Republican, to obtain all the information you possibly can relating to cures wrought by the internal application of Crude Mercury, I hereby submit to your notice, the following remarkable cure which was effected by taking inwardly not more than *one ounce*, of the above *incomparable* medicine. Having spoken frequently upon the *value* and *utility* of this *medicine*, as a remedy for most of the *Chronical diseases* to which so many people are subject in this country, in the presence of a female about twenty-seven or twenty-eight years of age, (a Mary Bowden of this town) she resolved to try it. She was at this time, labouring under a desperate disease of the stomach and chest of seven years standing, during which she could not wear stays, as it produced a great swelling and pain on the chest attended with considerable discharges of water from the mouth. Also an obstruction in the urinary



passage. During the seven years she was thus afflicted, she was at various times advised by her friends and acquaintances to take according to their different prescriptions; but to no purpose. At length she applied to a Dr. Thomson, a professional Gentleman of this place, and after consuming a large quantity of his drugs, *he gave her up*, as we sometimes call it, for a *bad job*, telling her at the same time, she would *never be cured*—but that, if she would smoke *tobacco*, when she felt the complaint approaching, she *might* gain a *little* relief. She was troubled with it more or less each day. Thus she continued until December last, when she took at *six* separate doses, *one ounce of Crude mercury, or quicksilver*. At the *first* dose, to the *astonishment* of *all* acquainted with the case, the *swelling* of the *chest* completely went down, and that day she *urined* not less than forty or fifty times. The second dose operated so effectually, that not a single symptom of the malady remained. It will be necessary to state here, that two days elapsed betwixt the taking of each dose. I forgot to mention the severe pain on the stomach, which she experienced whilst suffering as above stated. However, she took the other four doses and proclaimed herself cured. I advised her to take a little now and then, as I thought it would act as a preventive to the return of the disorder in future—she now wears her stays, is in excellent spirits, and feels herself much heartier than she has felt for some time, I may say for years past.

If you think this case worthy of *public notice*, its insertion in the Republican will much oblige

Your sincere well-wisher,

JOHN LAWTON.

No. 25, Dale Street,

Salford, Manchester.

TO MR. RICHARD CARLILE, DORCHESTER GAOL.

**MOST WORTHY SIR,** Fordmoss, February 12, 1825.  
Your valiant, steady and honest conduct is calculated to fill every Patriotic and Philanthropic mind with astonishment and admiration—The Titles of Lord, Baron, Viscount, Duke, Emperor &c., by way of Honour, have been given to Naval and Military Despots; Monuments have been erected to their memory; thousands of pounds have been settled upon them annually, that they might live in splendid idleness and luxury; but you are doing more for the amelioration of the human race, although immured in a prison, than they have all done in their bloody careers. They have been human Butchers, to satiate the ambition and promote the craft of Kings and Priests. As those valuable publications for which you are imprisoned are circulated, and the principles contained therein imbibed, so, in proportion, will the memory of these Despots descend to posterity with execration and contempt; whilst the fame, which you and your gallant shopmen have so justly merited will be indelibly engraven upon the pedestal of immortal honour. The whole host of Corruptionists have acquired their numbers with nothing but Brute force, bribery and sophistry, and which must inevitably make nothing but interested hypocrites, slaves, bigots or tyrants; but you, to gain proselytes to your opinions, would disdain to have recourse to such mean resources. You have made it evidently appear, that your motives are truly disinterested; for you wish to stand upon nothing but your own intrinsic merit. Instead of using any inducing sophism, or dissimulation, you have been bold, honest and brave. In your just warfare, the harmless weapons of a Goose-quill and a printing-Press have been your only instruments, and thereby wishing to publish, according to your knowledge, the principles of reason, truth and justice; consequently, the individuals who volunteer into your service must have a mind possessed of qualities congenial with your own. Your publications are the only Messiah which will emancipate the human mind from all Idolatry, superstition and bloody wars. Until the principles which they inculcate gain the ascendancy in the Public mind, and be acted upon, there will be no peace on earth, nor good will towards men; till then, and not till then, will



the glorious Sun of righteousness rise with healing under his wings and will shine more and more unto the perfect day.— It is better than two years, Sir, since, I and a few friends here, had an opportunity of procuring some of your publications, which after having perused, we esteemed very much. The neighbouring Priests, on hearing and being fully informed of this, and that some of us were actually converted to Deism, were immediately all in arms. Had you then, Sir, been in some of their Shops, you would have heard such cursing as perhaps you scarcely ever witnessed. You would have heard the man of God comparing the Infidels to the Devil's firebrands, wishing that the Magistrates were invested with double authority to imprison Carlile as a Lunatic for life. You would have seen him turning up his eyes to his Idol and invoking him with earnest solicitude to compel Atheists and Deists to hide their detested heads, and threatening his dupes, that, if they followed such characters, Hell, damnation and eternal torments, with the Devil and his Angels, amongst fire and brimstone, would be their doom. Thus, we see, though at times they exclaim against the practice of swearing, they are amongst the first rate swearers themselves, for they scarcely deliver a discourse, but they are incessantly using, with terrific emphasis against unbelievers, the words Lord, Gôd, damnation, Devil, Hell, accursed, &c.—But this was not all; knowing that our Master lived at a considerable distance from our dwelling, they were apprehensive, that he had not heard of the sad news: accordingly, they communicated to him the intelligence, no doubt, earnestly entreating him, not to keep such characters in his service. He, therefore, came to us, the day subsequent to the information, in order to ascertain the truth or falsehood of what he had heard. After his arrival, he, of course related the whole story to the overseer, and asked him, if there were any of the men of that opinion, adding, if there were, he would give them their leave of the work immediately (the most of us are Pitmen); but the overseer, unfortunately, was one of the despised men himself, and honestly made no hesitation of telling him so, and if the Master had not had the utmost confidence in the overseer's honest conduct towards him, and also the same confidence in us as servants, he would have undoubtedly made his former threats good. He, however, for the ensuing year, inserted in the Articles of agreement, that "We all must severally solemnly promise and engage not to take in nor read any Atheistical or Seditious publication, nor yet to

attend any meeting, club or assembly, where such subjects are discussed, on pain of being discharged on one hour's notice, by the said R. N., or his agent, from his service: and also, that, if we did not remove ourselves, family and furniture, from any House we might hold from him, within three days after the end of our term, we were to pay sixpence a day to him for every day we might hold over the said three days, &c."—Owing to the scarcity of work, we were necessarily obliged to engage for the following year; but never promised nor intended to confine ourselves to the above restrictions. When the threats of persecution had subsided, our only loss was to know how to get a convenient communication with your publications. We, at length, have obtained our wish, and have the Republican and other works that we need from Edinburgh. How long our repose may last, I cannot say, but we are determined, at all events, not to be prevented, if possible, from purchasing and reading any book we please.—From hence, my friend, we may see more and more the horrible effects of superstition and fanaticism, of which the Priests are the authors and instigators. Those pretended ambassadors of peace, notwithstanding all the boast they make of the strong foundation and striking evidence of their religion, manifest, by their own conduct, that it will not bear investigation, or else, they would not be so terrified about a few unlettered Pitmen investigating it.—Their followers cannot but see, that it is the fleece they wish to have secured to them, and not the flock; and, "however useful their profession might be to their souls, it is evident, they are no great friends to their bodies," or why do they make such an outcry about what they call infidelity, more than others? It may justly be inferred, that, if it were not for the interest of their craft, they would care as little for what they call their souls, about which they make so much pretended cant. Those Authors and promoters of ignorance know well, that, were their followers to eat of the forbidden Tree of infidel knowledge, they would again find little relish for the stupifying farrago which the Priest had hitherto so long dinned into their ears.—It is an important interest for the Priest to use every effort in his power, in order to stop the growth of this Tree in its bud; for the most of them are fully aware, that, if it were permitted to grow, the bramble by which they live and move and have their being, would soon wither and die, and that its branches are far more powerful than either the gates of Hell or Heaven, and its fruit infinitely more delicious and bene-



ficial to society than all their trumpery about Gods, Devils, Angels, Witches or Wizards.

We are still surrounded with bigots and fanatics, the most of which know nothing nor care nothing about the Bible, beyond what the Priest tells them, and manifest nothing but revenge when they hear the divine authority of their holy book questioned. Their chief answer is, that there is a day coming, which will to our awfull experience, make us repent, and seem by the distortion of their features, that, if they knew where Hell is, they would drag us hence immediately.—I think, that, if free discussion were established, it would tend much to the advancement of your opinions, were there men of deistical sentiments established through various parts of the Country, as teachers, and to preach every sunday in the support of Deism, and against the dogmas of the Priest. By this method, that Class of society which feels no taste nor inclination to read any subject whatever, and of whom far more than the majority of the people are composed, might be induced to search for themselves. This would be an excellent method of information, for those who are desirous of reading, but are not in ability to purchase books. There is nothing but one side of the question constantly reiterated in their ears; but I am persuaded, were there the one tenth of deistical preachers, to that of the number of Priests, regularly placed throughout the country, it would make a wonderfull revolution in the religious world. Sir, in order to assist you in your glorious warfare, as far as circumstances will permit, we have made out the following subscription.

One who feels disgusted at every sentiment that appears to be founded on fable or superstition	3 6	Andrew Messer	2 6
Thomas Crisp an admirer of Mr. Carlile	5 0	A Republican	1 0
James Smith	5 0	A Friend to free discussion	1 0
Robert Allan who considers that morality can be practised without the aid of either Ghost, Witch, or Devil	2 6	A Deist	0 6
George Patrick, an enemy to Kingcraft and Priestcraft	2 6	Margaret Punton a searcher after truth	0 6
		T. H.	1 0
		William Patrick, who at present cannot walk without the assistance of Crutches, lately effected by an accident, is sorry that his present situation prevents him giving more	1 0
		T. T.	2 6

Sir, may your future days be always attended with health of body, in order that your consequent intellectual powers





It may be well to recommend you to imitate, upon a small scale, the Mechanic's Institutions, which you see arising in all our large towns. This is the most important step that knowledge has yet made; because, every mechanic, indeed every labourer is a practical philosopher and should endeavour to make himself acquainted with whatever is known in theory relating to his trade. There is not a village in this Island but can find the means of establishing a library and a small laboratory for experiments, if its inhabitants were but wise enough to see its importance. If but half a dozen young men were to put aside a few pence weekly from their wages, they would soon form a useful library, which they could all read as they go on accumulating. They may go on from library to lecturing, and from lecturing, to practical or theoretical experiments of all kinds, and find, in the end, that they have spent nothing, that they have saved the time and money which they were wont to spend in the degrading alehouse, to apply it to the improvement of their minds, to raise them to a level with the best and brightest of mankind. A thirst for knowledge constitutes a happy life—that and that alone; because, under that disposition, the mind is always well occupied. The juggles of mystery are now flying before free discussion, nothing mysterious can be maintained; and the silly pastimes of mankind must yield to the growing thirst for knowledge. Knowledge is every man's property: a property in which we lose nothing by giving, in which generosity to others becomes improvement and generosity to self.

The maxim of religion has been to keep every man as ignorant as possible, I desire to equalize the knowledge of mankind by raising the most ignorant to an equality with the most wise and send on both in the path of mutual instruction. I am persecuted for this, you have been persecuted for associating yourselves with me; but we have a proud triumph, we see that our persecutors are neither so wise nor so honest as ourselves and the more they persecute the more they see this to their confusion and disgrace. I am inclined to think that men in this neighbourhood, who, on my first coming into it, would have gladly gathered each their faggott to burn me, would now as gladly do any thing in their power to get me out of this Gaol: and this has wholly arisen from their discovery, that, in all my actions and conversations, I have exhibited a superiority over them. They are growing heartily ashamed of their past feelings and conduct toward me.

I exhort you to proceed with the same perseverance with which you have begun and boldly but mildly communicate your knowledge to your neighbours and remain your zealous servant,

RICHARD CARLILE.

---

*Subscriptions received at 84, Fleet Street.*

---

	£.	s.	d.
W. D. King for Mr. Carlile	0	2	0
C. W. Sirrah	1	0	0
C. L., for Mr. Carlile	0	2	0
T. Hall, a countryman of Paine's is truly sorry to hear of the death of Hypatia Carlile	0	1	0
W. Fox	0	2	0
W. J., for Mr. Carlile, for January and February	0	4	0
Do. for Campion	0	2	0
Do. for Christopher	0	1	0
Innocent, two month's subscription	0	2	0
C. R., for the brave Mr. Carlile	0	5	0

---

TO A CORRESPONDENT.

---

I HAVE the pleasure to inform Epicurus, that the Letters of Freret to Eugenia were published in 1819, in the second volume of 'The Deist;' but I am sorry to say, that they are now out of print.

R. C.

---

Printed and Published by R. CARLILE, 84, Fleet Street.—All Correspondences for "The Republican" to be left at the place of publication.